

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 6, 2003 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1 and 3-16 remain pending in this application. Of these claims, claims 1 and 11 are independent and have been amended. Claim 2 has now been redrafted into independent form as amended claim 1, but has not otherwise been amended. Reconsideration of the above-identified application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Item 1 of the Office Action requires a “proper drawing correction or corrected drawings.” The October 31, 2002 reply to the previous Office Action had, as an attachment, a FIG. 1 with a “PRIOR ART” legend as specified in that previous Office Action. The present Office Action (item 1) has approved that submitted drawing. Formal drawings are being prepared and may be held in abeyance until the application is allowed.

Claims 1 and 9-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,073,010 to Dufour in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,544,253 to Chow et al. (“Chow”).

In response to the above rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the claims recite features neither taught nor suggested by Dufour alone or in combination with Chow. In order to clarify these distinctions, the subject matter of Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the subject matter of the present invention. In particular, claim 2 has now been redrafted into independent form as amended claim 1, but has not otherwise been amended. Item 4 of the Office Action concedes that Dufour and Chow, alone or in combination, fail to disclose “the limitations of claim 2 disclosing additional call establishment steps.” Claim 1 is therefore believed to be patentable over Dufour and

Chow for at least this reason. Independent claim 11 has also been amended to include the additional call establishment steps, and is likewise deemed to be patentable over Dufour and Chow.

The remaining claims, 9-10 and 12-16 depend from base claims 1 and 11, respectively, and are deemed to be patentable over the two references for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Dufour in view of Chow and U.S. Patent No. 6,044,261 to Kazmi.

As mentioned above, claim 2 has now been redrafted into independent form as amended claim 1, but has not otherwise been amended. Accordingly, claim 1 now recites:

“wherein the step (a) of establishing said call connection further includes the steps of:

(g) causing said BSC to request the home zone information of said MS from a MSC (Mobile Switching Center) in response to a request to establish said call connection between said MS and said BTS;

(h) causing said MSC to send the home zone information to said BSC;
and,

(i) storing the home zone information in said BSC.”

Dufour is silent on the specific procedure for establishing a call.

Item 4 of the current Office Action concedes that Kazmi merely discloses “causing said HLR to send the home zone information to said MSC,” but then explains that the Kazmi MSC serves as the equivalent of the BSC of the present invention. However, FIG. 1 of Kazmi shows an MSC 10 and a BSC 20. As the Office Action

concurs, Kazmi fails to disclose sending the home zone information to the BSC. Quoting from the Kazmi abstract, “In response to a request to establish a call . . . the serving mobile switching center (MSC) communicates . . . to determine which home zone is currently effective . . . The serving MSC then determines whether the mobile station is currently located within the determined home zone.” See also, for example, col. 6, lines 19-32 and col. 7, lines 7-10. Kazmi does not disclose or suggest that the home zone information is forwarded to the Kazmi BSC 20. For at least this reason, claim 1, which now incorporates former claim 2, is believed to be patentable over the applied references for at least this reason. Accordingly, claims 3-8, which depend from amended claim 1 are deemed to be patentable for at least this reason. Likewise, claim 11 and therefore its dependent claims 12-16, which also incorporate these additional call establishment steps are patentable over the applied references for at least the same reasons.

In view of the preceding remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the invention of Claims 1-16 is neither anticipated nor made obvious by Dufour, Chow or Kazmi alone or in combination.

If any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney in order that any outstanding issues may be resolved. If there are any fees due and owing, please charge Deposit Account No. 502-470.

Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHA & REITER

By:


Steve S. Cha
Registration No. 44,069
Attorney for Applicants

Date: August 4, 2003

Mail all correspondence to:

Steve S. Cha, Reg. No.: 44,069
CHA & REITER
411 Hackensack Ave, 9th Floor
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601
Tel: (201)518-5518
Fax:(201)518-5519

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on August 4, 2003.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Representative)


(Signature and Date)